

1/24/70

Dear Dick,

Your interesting memo on 399 arrived today. As you say, it is preliminary, so I'll await the rest.

We are, of course, in basic agreement. I've felt from the beginning that 399 was never used in passion, set about establishing this as best I could. When I discovered Frazier's N.O. test., I was satisfied nothing was gone that he and the rifling did not account for.

But we differ on photo-interpretation. I suggest when you are here again we examine it, if not by any other means, by having a new picture of it taken for you, duplicating the one for me (still anxious to see what they sent you--and no further word from John on this or anything else). I think you have missed a very obvious thing, but I withhold it until after you have finished this, not to interfere with your thinking and the development of your presentation.

If you do not plan to go into it later, I think it is an oversight not to address the possibility of the flattening by other means (I have this photo also, showing the flattening. Could it have been accomplished in a vice, for example. If only to say there are no other means, I think you should go into it. I do not know the answer.

Where you discuss the cotton batting, I think there are two things you should address: whether or not the bullet is marked by it and whether or not, with care, it can all be removed (or with chemicals).

Beginning the bottom of page 5, I think this stuff is real good. My own examination of the bullet immediately persuaded me it had never hit anything hard even on the wrong end because there were no marks, but this is amateur stuff. I think this business of the striae is persuasive. Also the powder. Can we take any kind of picture that would be definitive?

Study of this copy of your Exhibit 2 convinces me even more that more metal is missing. I anxiously await their duplication of my pictures, as I've asked in writing.

This copy accentuates the hair-like things at four o'clock in my picture. Can you explain it?

In your consideration of lighting and shadow, to see how close to 90 degree lighting I had, study the transparent scale. It is only 1/5mm from casting no shadow at all. I am sure he also had side lighting of some kind. Anyway, I believe if the 12-3 o'clock part of the outer edge of what you call the crater in my picture were, it would have the same tone as the rest of it. And why do lumps A and B have different tones in Howard's picture?...Haris, above, could be from packing in box.

The whole thing gets more, not less fascinating. I await the rest.

Best,